REPORT RESUMES

ED 012 599 JC 660 296

TESTING PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS IN JUNIOR COLLEGES--A SURVEY.

BY- SEIBEL, DEAN W.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, N.J.
REPORT NUMBER ETS-FSR-2 PUB DATE SEP 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.80 95P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *TESTING PROGRAMS, *TEST SELECTION, *MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, RESEARCH TOOLS, GUIDANCE, ADMISSION (SCHOOL), APTITUDE TESTS, PLACEMENT, COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS, PRINCETON

DURING A SERIES OF VISITS TO A SELECTED SAMPLE OF 63 JUNIOR COLLEGES, DISCUSSIONS WERE HELD WITH STAFF MEMBERS CONCERNING TESTING PRACTICES, PROBLEMS, AND NEEDS. DATA ON THE KINDS OF STANDARDIZED TESTS USED, THE PURPOSES OF USING EACH KIND OF TEST, THE SPECIFIC TESTS USED, TESTING NEEDS AND PROBLEMS, AND ATTITUDES TOWARD TESTING ARE SUMMARIZED IN THE REPORT FOR BOTH PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT JUNIOR COLLEGES. STANDARDIZED TESTS ARE WIDELY USED IN JUNIOR COLLEGES, PARTICULARLY DURING AN INITIAL PERIOD EXTENDING THROUGH THE FIRST SEMESTER OF THE FRESHMAN YEAR. EVALUATION NEEDS OF THE INSTITUTIONS SEEM TO BE MET BY TESTING IN THE AREAS OF ADMISSION, GUIDANCE, PLACEMENT, AND RESEARCH. PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED INCLUDE LACK OF APPROPRIATE NORMS, DIFFICULTY IN LOCATING OR SELECTING APPROPRIATE TESTS, AND INADEQUATE USE OF TEST INFORMATION. EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST AND NEED INDICATE SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TESTS TO MEET NEWLY DEFINED MEASUREMENT OBJECTIVES. (AL)

ED012599

EAS FIELD STUDIES REPOR
EVALUATION AND ADVISORY SERVIC
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Testing Practices and Problems in Junior Colleges—A Survey

Dean W. Seibel
Director of Field Studies

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 28 1966

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

FSR-2 | SEPTEMBER, 1966

JC 660 296

TESTING PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS
IN JUNIOR COLLEGES - A SURVEY

Dean W. Seibel

Director of Field Studies
Evaluation and Advisory Service

Field Studies Report, FSR-2
September, 1966

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, New Jersey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

ABSTRACT v

LIST OF TABLES vii

BACKGROUND 1

METHOD 3

  Sample of Junior Colleges 3
  Visits to Junior Colleges 5
  Data 8

RESULTS 11

  Initial Testing 11
    Initial Use of General Ability Tests 12
    Initial Use of Intelligence Tests 19
    Initial Use of Tests Measuring Broad Subject-Matter Areas 19
    Initial Use of Achievement Tests 22
    Initial Use of Interest Inventories 26
    Initial Use of Special Aptitude Tests 33
    Initial Use of Personality Tests 33
    Summary of Initial Testing 38
  Subsequent Use of Standardized Tests 41
  Teacher Use of Standardized Tests 41
  Specialized Use of Standardized Tests 47
  Use of Standardized Tests with Individual Students 47
  Other Related Testing Practices 47
    Testing Centers 50
    In-Service Measurement Training 50
  Use of Standardized Test Scores 50
    Constructing and Using Local Norms 53
    Reporting Test Scores to Faculty 53
    Reporting Test Scores to Students 53
  Testing Needs and Problems 56
  Faculty and Student Interest in Testing 63

Page

Faculty Interest in Testing 63
Student Interest in Testing 66

SUMMARY 67

Typical Testing Practices at Public Junior Colleges 67
Typical Testing Practices at Independent Junior Colleges 69
Testing Needs and Problems 70
Conclusions 71

REFERENCES 73

APPENDIX 1: Participating Colleges 75

APPENDIX 2: Initial Contact Letter 79

APPENDIX 3: Description of Field Studies Program 83

APPENDIX 4: Tests and Testing Programs 87

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Russell W. Martin for
Educational Testing Service
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright - 1966 by Educational Testing Service.
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his thanks and appreciation to the following for contributions to the study and the report:

Dr. William W. Turnbull, Executive Vice President, Educational Testing Service; and Dr. John S. Helmick, Vice President, Educational Testing Service for providing helpful direction particularly during the planning stage of the study, and for reviewing this manuscript.

Miss Anna Dragositz, Director, Evaluation and Advisory Service, Educational Testing Service for providing valuable advice and encouragement throughout the course of the study, for arranging the necessary financial and operational support, and for reviewing this manuscript.

Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director, American Association of Junior Colleges, and Dr. Thomas B. Merson, Director of Research, California Association of Junior Colleges (formerly Assistant Director, AAJC), for assistance in working out methods to accomplish the visits to junior colleges.

Dr. Joseph W. Fordyce, President, Santa Fe Junior College (formerly Chairman of the AAJC Commission on Student Personnel); and Dr. William G. Dwyer, President, Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges (formerly Chairman of the AAJC Commission on Curriculum) for providing the writer with the opportunity to discuss the field studies program with members of their Commissions.

Dr. Max R. Raines, Associate Professor of Higher Education, Michigan State University for providing information on junior college testing practices which he obtained as part of the study by the National Committee for the Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs; Dr. Terry U. O'Banion, Dean of Students, Santa Fe Junior College for sharing data from a survey conducted by the Student Personnel Commission of the Florida Association of Public Junior Colleges; and Mr. M. Ray Busby, Copiah-Lincoln Junior College for providing data on test usage from his survey of junior colleges in Mississippi.

Dr. J. Richard Harsh, Director, Southern California Regional Office of Educational Testing Service; and Mr. Richard O. Fortna, Professional Associate, Advisory Service Department, Western Office, Educational Testing Service for making all the necessary arrangements for visiting the sample colleges in California.

Miss Barbara A. Pryor, Secretary, Evaluation and Advisory Service, Educational Testing Service for lending valuable assistance in the analysis of the data and in the preparation and writing of this report, and for making many of the necessary travel arrangements.

And lastly, the sixty-three junior colleges that cooperated in this study, for the hospitality they extended to the writer; and the one hundred forty junior college staff members who gave liberally of their time to discuss testing practices and problems, thereby providing the basic data for this report.

Dean W. Seibel

ABSTRACT

Through a series of visits to a selected sample of sixty-three junior colleges, discussions were held with staff members concerning testing practices, problems, and needs. Information on the kinds of standardized tests used, the purposes of using each kind of test, the specific tests used, testing needs and problems, and attitudes toward testing was obtained and is summarized in the report. Data for both public and independent junior colleges are presented which show the number and percent of colleges engaging in each testing practice.

The findings support the notion that standardized tests are widely used in junior colleges, particularly during an initial period extending through the first semester of the freshman year. While the tests seem to be meeting many evaluation needs of junior colleges in the areas of admission, guidance, placement, and research; the junior colleges are having some difficulty making use of presently available instruments and feel the need for additional kinds of tests to meet some of their evaluation needs. There is considerable interest in tests and test usage on the part of the administration, faculty, and students.

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 1 Descriptive Information for the Field Studies Sample of Junior Colleges and for the Population of Junior Colleges 4

TABLE 2 Numbers and Percents of Colleges at which Various Numbers of Persons Were Interviewed 6

TABLE 3 Numbers and Percents of Colleges at which Persons Holding Various Positions Were Interviewed 7

TABLE 4 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of General Ability Tests According to Extent of Usage 13

TABLE 5 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of General Ability Tests According to Purpose of Testing 15

TABLE 6 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of General Ability Tests According to Specific Test 17

TABLE 7 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of General Ability Tests According to Number of Tests Used 18

TABLE 8 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Intelligence Tests According to Extent of Usage 20

TABLE 9 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Intelligence Tests According to Purpose of Testing 21

TABLE 10 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Broad Subject-Matter Area Tests According to Extent of Usage 23

TABLE 11 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Broad Subject-Matter Area Tests According to Purpose of Testing 24

TABLE 12 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Broad Subject-Matter Area Tests According to Specific Test 25

TABLE 13 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Achievement Tests 27

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Page

TABLE 14 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Achievement Tests According to Purpose of Testing 28

TABLE 15 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Achievement Tests According to Subject-Matter Area 29

TABLE 16 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Interest Inventories According to Extent of Usage 30

TABLE 17 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Interest Inventories According to Purpose of Testing 31

TABLE 18 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Interest Inventories According to Specific Test 32

TABLE 19 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Special Aptitude Tests According to Extent of Usage 34

TABLE 20 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Special Aptitude Tests According to Purpose of Testing 35

TABLE 21 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Special Aptitude Tests According to Specific Test 36

TABLE 22 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Personality Tests According to Extent of Usage 37

TABLE 23 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Standardized Tests According to Number of Different Kinds of Tests Administered 39

TABLE 24 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Standardized Tests According to Number of Different Tests Administered 40

TABLE 25 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Subsequent Use of Standardized Tests 42

TABLE 26 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Subsequent Use of Standardized Tests According to Purpose of Testing 43

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Page

TABLE 27 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Subsequent Use of Standardized Tests According to Specific Test 41

TABLE 28 Numbers and Percents of Colleges in which Teachers Use Standardized Tests for Classroom Evaluation 45

TABLE 29 Numbers and Percents of Colleges in which Teachers Use Standardized Tests for Classroom Evaluation According to Subject-Matter Area 46

TABLE 30 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Specialized Use of Standardized Tests According to Specific Test Used 48

TABLE 31 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Administering Standardized Tests to Individual Students 49

TABLE 32 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Serving as Test Centers for National Testing Programs 51

TABLE 33 Numbers and Percents of Colleges that Have In-Service Training Programs in Measurement 52

TABLE 34 Numbers and Percents of Colleges that Make Use of Local Norms 54

TABLE 35 Numbers and Percents of Colleges that Report Test Scores to Faculty 55

TABLE 36 Numbers and Percents of Colleges that Report Test Scores to Students 57

TABLE 37 Numbers and Percents of Colleges Reporting Various Testing Needs and Problems 58

TABLE 38 Numbers and Percents of Colleges According to Faculty Interest in Testing 64

TABLE 39 Numbers and Percents of Colleges According to Student Interest in Testing 65

BACKGROUND

Over the past few years the junior college movement in the United State has undergone considerable development. Growth has taken place not only in the number of junior colleges, but also in the enrollments of existing junior colleges.

Figures from the 1961 Junior College Directory(1) show that in 1950 there were 597 junior colleges enrolling about 580,000 students. In 1960 the figures had grown to 663 institutions enrolling 800,000 students. The latest available information from the 1966 Directory(2) shows that there are now 771 junior colleges with about 1,300,000 students.

There are, of course, many administrative and educational problems that are caused by, or at least associated with, this rapid growth and development. It would seem that information derived from standardized tests might be valuable in helping to solve many of these problems, particularly in the areas of admission, guidance, course placement, and institutional and student evaluation.

Nearly all of the available standardized tests which might be used in junior colleges were developed primarily for use in either four-year colleges or secondary schools. The junior college, however, is neither a decaptiated university nor a glorified high school. As Gleazer has commented:

> "The community college has its most productive development not when it is conceived of as the first two years of the baccalaureate degree program, nor when seen as grades thirteen and fourteen, but as an institution in its own right--a new kind of college--standing between the high school and the university--offering broad programs of experiences of value in and of themselves, neither post-high school as such or pre-college as such."(3)

It seems appropriate to raise several questions concerning the use of presently available standardized tests in this unique kind of educational institution: How extensively are standardized tests used in junior colleges? In what ways are they used? Are additional kinds of tests needed? What problems are encountered in their use?

As a first step in answering these and similar questions, the Evaluation and Advisory Service, a division of Educational Testing Service, undertook a field studies program designed to gather data which, it is hoped, will shed light on the practices and problems of standardized test usage in junior colleges.

This kind of information, of course, must come from the junior colleges themselves. The possibility of undertaking a questionnaire survey to obtain the information was considered, and temporarily rejected on the grounds that there was insufficient information available on junior college testing to enable us either to construct a meaningful questionnaire or to put it in the hands of the most appropriate staff members at the junior colleges.

Since a questionnaire survey seemed premature at this time, it was decided to undertake a field studies program of visits to a selected sample of junior colleges. Face-to-face discussion, it was thought, would be much more likely to result in meaningful information. While the primary objective of the visits was to obtain information about junior college testing practices, problems, and needs; a second, and perhaps equally important objective was to provide the junior colleges with advisory assistance in dealing with any testing problems which they might be having. The dual nature of the visits complemented each other and enabled us to meet several needs through one activity. In this paper we shall attempt to summarize and report objectively some of the various information on testing practices and problems gathered during these visits to the junior colleges.

METHOD

Sample of Junior Colleges

During academic years 1964-65 and 1965-66 visits were made to a selected sample of sixty-three junior colleges. Eighteen states were represented in the sample. While we were not rigid in making this a representative sample, we did attempt to visit a wide variety of junior colleges in terms of variables such as control (public-independent), size, type of student (men, women, coed), geographic location, and type of college (residential-commuting). We also tried to include not only colleges emphasizing preparation of students for transfer to four-year institutions, but also those that offered vocationally oriented programs. It should be pointed out that the colleges were not selected on the basis of any previous knowledge of testing practices or attitudes.

That the sample of colleges visited is reasonably representative of the population can be seen by examining the figures in Table 1. We have listed here, for comparison, frequency distributions and percentages for the sample and for the population according to four commonly used descriptive variables. While the distributions for the sample and the population are similar for the four variables--Control, Size, Type of Student, and Type of College--the sample seems to be over-represented by large, public colleges whose students commute. This is not too inappropriate, however. An examination of the Junior College Directory for the past few years reveals that much of the growth and development of the institution can be accounted for by the large public junior colleges, and these are, almost without exception, commuting-type colleges rather than residential. If this trend continues, as seems likely, it becomes increasingly appropriate to weight our findings more heavily with this type of institution.

Although similarity of the sample and population is important and interesting to note, it is the variety represented in the sample that we wish to emphasize. Additional evidence of this variety is found in the fact that forty-nine of the sixty-three colleges offer comprehensive programs (both university-parallel and vocationally oritented)(5) and fourteen institutions offer programs designed only for transfer students.

A listing of the 63 institutions visited is contained in Appendix 1.

TABLE 1

Descriptive Information for the Field Studies Sample of Junior Colleges and for the Population of Junior Colleges

	Sample		Population(d)	
Descriptive Variable	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
CONTROL(a)				
Public	42	67	452	63
Independent	21	33	267	37
Total	63	100	719	100
SIZE(b)				
0 - 499	21	33	340	50
500 - 999	13	21	140	20
1000 - 1999	6	10	86	13
2000 and above	23	37	119	17
Total	63	101(e)	685	100
TYPE OF STUDENT(c)				
Men only	2	3	40	6
Women only	9	14	67	10
Coed	52	83	542	84
Total	63	100	649	100
TYPE OF COLLEGE(c)				
Residential	23	37	313	48
Commuting	40	63	342	52
Total	63	100	655	100

(a) Figures for the Population are derived from the 1965 Junior College Directory(4) (Tables II, III, and IV).

(b) The "Size" of a college is considered to be the number of full-time students enrolled in October, 1963. Figures for the Population are derived from the 1965 Junior College Directory(4) (Table V).

(c) Figures for the Population are derived from the 6th Edition (1963) of American Junior Colleges(5).

(d) The number of junior colleges in the Population varies because different source documents were used (see a, b, and c, above) and because certain types of information were not reported for some junior colleges listed in the source documents.

(e) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

Visits to Junior Colleges

Before undertaking visits to any of the colleges, contact was established with the American Association of Junior Colleges. This was done in order to keep them informed of our activities with junior colleges and to obtain their reactions and advice concerning the field studies program of visits. Several AAJC staff members discussed the program with us. They concurred as to the value of such a program and offered a number of helpful suggestions regarding the methodology.

The visits were begun in the fall of 1964 and continued through the spring of 1966. In arranging each visit, initial contact was made with the administrative head of the institution. A letter (Appendix 2) requesting the visit, and a brief description of the field studies program (Appendix 3) were sent about a month in advance of the desired date of visit. These were followed with a phone call to make the specific arrangements. The objectives of these communications were first, to obtain approval for the visit, and, second, to maximize the probability that contact would be established with the persons at the colleges who were most directly involved with the use of standardized tests.

It should be noted here that the request for a visit was denied at only two junior colleges, and the reason for denial at one of these was that the college was in the process of dissolution. Furthermore, in only one instance did a junior college staff member refuse to discuss with the writer the college's testing practices, and in this instance permission was obtained to interview an alternate staff member. The writer wishes publicly to express his appreciation to the junior colleges for their hospitality in receiving him and for their willingness to discuss all aspects of standardized test usage.

Tables 2 and 3 show the number of persons interviewed at each college and the positions at the college represented by the persons interviewed. At most colleges one or two persons were interviewed (Table 2); however, as many as six or seven persons were interviewed at several colleges. It is important to note that at over sixty percent of the colleges at least two persons were interviewed. This probably operates to reduce the possibility that our data contain inaccurate information on test usage or information which is biased by a particular person's attitude toward testing. The figures also might indicated that at most junior colleges responsibility for testing, or, at least, interest in testing, is shared by several persons.

The categories of positions (Table 3) may need some explanation. In the category of "Academic Dean" we have included such titles as Dean of the

TABLE 2

Numbers and Percents of Colleges at which Various Numbers of Persons were Interviewed

Number of Persons Interviewed	Number of Colleges	Percent of Colleges
1	24	38
2	21	33
3	8	13
4	4	6
5	3	5
6	2	3
7	1	2
Total	63	100

TABLE 3

Numbers and Percents of Colleges at which Persons Holding Various Positions were Interviewed[a]

Position	Number of Colleges	Percent of Colleges[b]
Chief Administrative Officer	23	37
Academic Dean	23	37
Director of Student Personnel	44	70
Admission Officer	14	22
Counselor	5	8
Director of Testing	8	13
Teacher	9	14
Other	3	5

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The percentages are based on 63 colleges.

College, Dean of Instruction, Dean of the Faculty, and Administrative Dean, as well as the respective Assistant Deans. "Director of Student Personnel" includes titles such as Dean of Students (of Men or of Women), Director of Guidance, (and variations on these titles) as well as the Assistants to these positions. "Admission Officer" includes Director of Admission, Registrar, and respective Assistants. At some institutions, one person carried several titles or held a combination of positions such as Director of Guidance and Admission. In these instances the person was classified into the category which seemed most relevant to the college's use of tests.

A person classified as "Director of Student Personnel" was interviewed most frequently (at seventy percent of the colleges) while Presidents, Deans, and Admission Officers were interviewed less frequently but still in substantial number. The small percentage of colleges (8%) at which counselors were interviewed can be accounted for by the fact that counselors often work under the direction of the "Director of Student Personnel", and at most colleges it did not seem valuable nor logical to interview both a counselor and the person directing this activity. Since only a few junior colleges have a position concerned exclusively with testing, it is not surprising that a "Director of Testing" was interviewed at only eight of the colleges (13 percent of the sample). In fact, only ten of the colleges in our sample had staff members whose titles indicated they were primarily responsible for testing activities at the college. The two instances where we did not interview this staff member resulted from unavoidable scheduling problems. The person was simply not available when the writer visited the college.

In view of the way in which arrangements for the visits were made, the data in Table 3 probably provide a rough indication of where in junior colleges the responsibility for testing lies. If not this, then at least the data may indicate who at the junior college is interested in testing.

Data

A word should be said concerning the nature of the data which are reported below. The interviews, of course, were the basic source of these data. These interviews, however, were unstructured except for the rather broad suggestions offered in the initial description of the field studies program (see Appendix 3). We made no further attempt to provide structure since we were not familiar enough with testing practices, problems, and attitudes in junior colleges to be able to pre-specify the exact questions to ask. One effect which this had was that we did not obtain exactly the same kinds or amount of information from all colleges. The reader will note that for some types of testing information discussed below it was necessary to utilize categories of "not ascertained" or "unidentified". When these are used it means that the particular type of information was not obtained during the interviews at one or more colleges. Fortunately, this occurs infrequently and is limited primarily to the information regarding faculty and student interest in testing.

The writer took notes during each interview and, as soon as feasible thereafter, prepared a detailed written report. No attempt was made, however, to quantify or categorize any of the information until all sixty-three visits were completed. Then, the reports and notes from all visits were reviewed and ex post facto categories of each type of testing information were established. Colleges were then classified on each item of testing information according to the data contained in the interview reports.

Several supplementary sources of information on testing practices at the colleges were also used. The catalog of each college was examined and any indication of test usage was noted. The information bulletins for both the College Board Admission Tests(6) and the American College Testing Program(7) were examined, and information as to whether a particular college served as a testing center for either or both of these two national testing programs was noted. Additional supplementary information was supplied by several individuals (see Acknowledgments). The data obtained from these supplementary sources were used primarily to verify information obtained during the interviews.

RESULTS

The data on testing practices and problems reported below represent a classification and summary of the testing information contained in the interview reports and the supplementary sources. The information on test usage refers only to the use of published standardized tests. In some instances, locally constructed tests were in use, but these are not considered in this report. We have included, however, the use of tests through participation in state testing programs (e.g., New York and Florida have state testing programs for high school seniors, the results of which are reported to and used by some junior colleges in these states) even though these may not be strictly published standardized tests.

Attempts to classify tests or information on test usage are rarely successful and, even when accomplished, suffer limitations and inconsistencies. That is, a given standardized test might be classified in several ways--as an intelligence test (it measures intelligent behavior), as an aptitude test (it can be used to predict future behavior), and as an achievement test (it measures learned behavior). Similarly a given standardized test might be used for a variety of purposes, for example for guidance and for placement. We have, however, attempted to classify the information obtained through the interviews into some meaningful categories. At the same time, we recognize that this represents subjective judgments on the writer's part, and that other classifications of the information might be equally reasonable.

In the sections which follow we shall deal first with testing practices including initial testing, subsequent testing, classroom testing, special testing, individual testing, testing centers, and in-service measurement training programs; next with some specific uses of test score information; then with testing needs and problems; and finally with faculty and student attitudes toward testing.

Initial Testing

This section will cover any testing which the college does or which is done for the college (state or national testing programs) involving the administration of standardized tests to entering freshman students either just before or just after enrollment (last semester of senior year in high school or first semester of freshman year in college). The tests might be administered to the entire enrolling group or to special subgroups (e.g., all freshmen entering the nursing program, or all out-of-state students). The test results might be used for a variety of purposes, and scores from one test might be used for several purposes. In reporting the information on initial testing we have separated the data according to the type of test used (following Buros' classification(8)), and for each type of test we have reported information on the extent of usage, purposes, and specific tests used (see Appendix 4 for a listing of the tests or testing programs used at one or more of the sample colleges).

Initial Use of General Ability Tests

The tests in this category are those which Buros has classified as "group intelligence tests". These include tests variously called scholastic aptitude tests, academic ability tests, intelligence tests, mental ability tests, etc. We prefer to refer to these tests as "general ability tests" reserving the term "intelligence tests" for a special sub-category of tests which yield mental age scores or IQ scores.

The content of these general ability tests is usually not related to any specific body of subject matter. One or several scores may be derived, such as a verbal score, a quantitative score (numerical, mathematical, etc.), a total score, or an IQ. The tests are recognized predictors of future academic success in a wide variety of situations.

Table 4 shows the extent to which the junior colleges made initial use of general ability tests. Eighty-one percent of the colleges used this type of test with their entire entering classes. A slightly larger proportion of the independent colleges (86%) used the tests than did the public colleges (79%). A few colleges (6%) used the tests initially but only with special subgroups. Only thirteen percent of the sample junior colleges made no initial use whatever of general ability tests, and among independent colleges only five percent did not use them.

Table 5 shows the extent to which the colleges made initial use of general ability tests for various purposes. Since we shall be making continued reference to these purposes when the uses of other kinds of tests are examined, an initial explanation of them seems in order.

> Selective Admission - A college is considered to be using a test for selective admission if the test score is at least one of the factors considered by the college in making the decisions to admit or reject applicants.

TABLE 4

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of General Ability Tests According to Extent of Usage

	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
Extent of Usage	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Used with entire freshman class	33	79	18	86	51	81
Used with subgroups of freshman class only	2	5	2	10	4	6
Not used	7	17	1	5	8	13
Total	42	101 (a)	21	101 (a)	63	100

(a) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

Guidance or Counseling - A college is classified as using a test for guidance or counseling if the test scores are used by the guidance staff in the process of counseling students.

Course Placement - A college is considered to be using a test for course placement if the test score is at least one of the elements considered in assigning students to different sections or levels of a particular course. (This is not the case of helping students decide on courses of study or programs--a guidance function.)

Research - Sometimes a college administers a test to students with the intention of obtaining information about college or student-body characteristics, or in order to investigate the validity of the test. In these kinds of situations the colleges is considered to be using the test for research purposes.

Service to Outsiders - When a college administers a test to students because an outside agency (four-year college, state department of education, employer) requires or requests that the information be available, the college is considered to be administering the test as a service to outsiders.

These categories of purposes are admittedly quite general and do not indicate specifically how the test information is used. They do, however, seem to encompass the major purposes of using standardized tests which we encountered. It should be noted that a college might use a test for more than one of these purposes and, consequently, be included several times in any of the tables which report the number of colleges using tests for the various purposes.

As Table 5 shows, twenty-nine percent of the fifty-five colleges that used general ability tests initially, used them to aid in a selective admission process. In view of the "open door" admission policy at many of the public junior colleges, it is not surprising that only six percent of the public colleges

TABLE 5

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of General Ability Tests According to Purpose of Testing[a]

Purpose of Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]
Selective admission	2	6	14	70	16	29
Guidance or counseling	33	94	13	65	46	84
Course placement	18	51	8	40	26	47
Research	2	6	3	15	5	9
Service to outsiders	3	9	3	15	6	11
Other	1	3	1	5	2	4
Number of Colleges Using General Ability Tests	35		20		55	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

used the tests for this purpose. At independent colleges, which typically are more selective, we found that seventy percent of those using general ability tests, used them as part of a selective admission procedure.

The most frequently reported purpose for using general ability tests was guidance or counseling. Eighty-four percent of the fifty-five colleges reported that the tests were used for this purpose. The public junior college's emphasis on student guidance probably accounts for the fact that while ninety-four percent of the public colleges used them for counseling, only sixty-five percent of the independent colleges did so. Nearly half (47%) of the using colleges reported that the general ability test scores were a factor in course placement.

Tables 6 and 7 refer to the frequency of usage of specific general ability tests. Table 6 shows the number of colleges using each of eight specific tests, and Table 7 shows the number of different general ability tests used by each college. The most frequently used test was the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), and it was used at forty-five percent of the fifty-five colleges. This was followed closely by the School and College Ability Tests (SCAT) and the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests (OTIS). Substantial use was made of the College Qualification Tests (CQT) and the American Council on Education Psychological Examination (ACE), with isolated instances of California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM), Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability (H-N), and Ohio State University Psychological Test (OSU) usage. These findings vary somewhat when we examine usage according to type of college. Independent colleges overwhelmingly used the SAT (80%) and substantial use was made of the OTIS. Public colleges, however, used SCAT most frequently. Substantial use was made of the SAT, OTIS, and CQT, and to a slightly lesser degree, the ACE.

As will be recalled (see Table 4), only four of these fifty-five colleges used general ability tests with subgroups only. This means that in most instances general ability tests were administered to entire entering freshman classes. Table 7 shows, however, that nearly half of the junior colleges (45%) used two or more of these tests. At first, this might seem to represent considerable duplication of testing since all of the general ability tests provide essentially the same kind of information (they are all general measures of academic ability). It is probably true that many colleges were doing some unnecessary testing. However, it was frequently reported that multiple testing of this kind was done so that one test could be used as a

TABLE 6

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of General Ability Tests According to Specific Test[a]

Test[b]	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[c]	Number	Percent[c]	Number	Percent[c]
American Council on Education Psychological Examination (ACE)	6	17	2	10	8	15
California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM)	1	3	0	0	1	2
College Qualification Tests (CQT)	8	23	1	5	9	16
Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability (H-N)	1	3	0	0	1	2
Ohio State University Psychological Test (OSU)	0	0	1	5	1	2
Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests (OTIS)	8	23	11	55	19	35
Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	9	26	16	80	25	45
School and College Ability Tests (SCAT)	16	46	5	25	21	38
Number of Colleges Using General Ability Tests	35		20		55	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) Tests and publishers are listed in Appendix 4.

(c) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

TABLE 7

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of General Ability Tests According to Number of Tests Used

Number of Tests	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent(a)	Number	Percent(a)	Number	Percent(a)
One	22	63	8	40	30	55
Two	12	34	8	40	20	36
Three	1	3	4	20	5	9
Number of Colleges Using General Ability Tests	35		20		55	

(a) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

verification of, or check on, the results of the other. Another frequently reported reason for this multiple testing relates to the kinds of scores obtained from the various tests.

Initial Use of Intelligence Tests

A number of the junior colleges visited seemed especially concerned about having IQ scores for their entering freshmen. Some felt that this particular kind of test score was more meaningful to the teachers, other felt that the prospective employers of their students wanted it in the students' records, still others felt that student records would simply not be complete without an IQ. For whatever reasons, there seemed to be sufficient interest in this type of score to warrant our presenting data separately for the general ability tests that yield IQ scores (or some derivative such as Deviation IQ's). Consequently, we have separated the IQ-yielding tests from the other general ability tests and analyized their use below. The specific tests included here are the OTIS, the CTMM, and the H-N.

Only twenty-seven percent of the junior colleges administered intelligence tests to their entire entering classes (Table 8). Sixty-seven percent made no use of them whatever. The proportional usage is over twice as great among independent colleges as among public colleges (53% vs. 24%).

Table 9 shows that most of the colleges administering intelligence tests used the results for guidance purposes. Some (14%) used the results for course placement, and some (14%) administered them as a service to outsiders. The colleges administering them as a service are all independent colleges.

Data on the frequency of specific test usage are not presented here since the information is contained in Table 6.

Initial Use of Tests Measuring Broad Subject-Matter Areas

The tests considered here are those which measure achievement or ability in broad subject-matter areas (for example, science, social studies, English, mathematics). These tests lie somewhere between the general ability tests, which are not highly related to any subject-matter area, and achievement tests (see below) which are directly related to specific subject-matter areas. For example, a general ability test might provide a measure of general quantitative ability;

TABLE 8

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Intelligence Tests(a) According to Extent of Usage(b)

Extent of Usage	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Used with entire freshman class	8	19	9	43	17	27
Used with subgroups of freshman class only	2	5	2	10	4	6
Not used	32	76	10	48	42	67
Total	42	100	21	101(c)	63	100

(a) Intelligence tests are defined as those tests yielding an IQ score or a derivative of the IQ score.

(b) The data reported in this table are part of the data reported in Table 4.

(c) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 9

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Intelligence Tests(a) According to Purpose of Testing(b)

Purpose of Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent(c)	Number	Percent(c)	Number	Percent(c)
Selective admission	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guidance or counseling	10	100	7	64	17	81
Course placement	1	10	2	18	3	14
Research	0	0	0	0	0	0
Service to outsiders	0	0	3	27	3	14
Other	0	0	1	9	1	5
Number of Colleges Making Use of Intelligence Tests	10		11		21	

(a) Intelligence tests are defined as those tests yielding an IQ score or a derivative of the IQ score.

(b) The data reported in this table are part of the data reported in Table 5. Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(c) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

a broad subject-matter test might provide a measure of ability in mathematics; and an achievement test might provide a measure of ability in second-year algebra. Buros has called these broad subject-matter tests "achievement batteries."

Broad subject-matter tests were not as frequently used in the junior colleges as general ability tests. Table 10 shows that fifty-two percent of the sample colleges made use of the broad subject-matter tests as opposed to eighty-seven percent for the general ability tests (see Table 4). In contrast with the use of general ability tests, the broad subject-matter tests were used by a higher proportion of public colleges than independent ones.

The patterns of testing purposes as shown in Tables 11 and 5 are also somewhat different for the two kinds of tests. While the predominant purpose of using each kind of test was guidance or counseling, higher proportions of colleges administered the broad subject-matter tests for research and for service purposes. Even though the broad subject-matter tests might seem to be more appropriate for placement than the general ability tests, we find that a smaller percentage used these tests for course placement (39%) than was the case for general ability tests (47%).

Table 12 shows the frequency of usage for each broad subject-matter test encountered. The American College Testing Program (ACT) was used by a majority of the colleges that use this kind of test (58%), and the proportion was somewhat higher among independent colleges (70%) than among public colleges (52%). State testing programs were utilized by a substantial proportion of colleges (24%), all of which are public.

Initial Use of Achievement Tests

The tests considered here are those measuring achievement in specific areas of subject matter such as might be taught in a single course. Because of the nature of these tests and their use we have deviated from the previous pattern of reporting data. Almost without exception the initial use which colleges made of achievement tests involved administration of the tests to specific subgroups of the freshman classes. These were usually subgroups who were enrolling in specific programs or courses. Consequently, we have reported data for colleges only in terms of whether or not this type of test was used, regardless of the group of students involved. It should be pointed out also, that these initially used achievement tests usually covered subject matter that is normally taught at the high school level, and the variety of available tests

TABLE 10

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Broad Subject-Matter Area Tests According to Extent of Usage

	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
Extent of Usage	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Used with entire freshman class	21	50	8	38	29	46
Used with subgroups of freshman class only	2	5	2	10	4	6
Not used	19	45	11	52	30	48
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

TABLE 11

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Broad Subject-Matter Area Tests According to Purpose of Testing[a]

Purpose of Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]
Selective admission	0	0	2	20	2	6
Guidance or counseling	15	65	4	40	19	58
Course placement	9	39	4	40	13	39
Research	2	9	4	40	6	18
Service to outsiders	4	17	3	30	7	21
Other	0	0	1	10	1	3
Number of Colleges Using Broad Subject-Matter Tests	23		10		33	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

TABLE 12

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Broad Subject-Matter Area Tests According to Specific Test[a]

Test[b]	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[c]	Number	Percent[c]	Number	Percent[c]
American College Testing Program Examination (ACT)	12	52	7	70	19	58
Comprehensive College Testing Program (CCTP)	0	0	1	10	1	3
Tests of General Educational Development (GED)	1	4	0	0	1	3
Iowa High School Content Examination (IHSC)	1	4	1	10	2	6
Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED)	1	4	0	0	1	3
Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT)	0	0	1	10	1	3
Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP)	2	9	2	20	4	12
State Testing Programs (New York and Florida)	8	35	0	0	8	24
Number of Colleges Using Broad Subject-Matter Tests	23		10		33	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) Tests and publishers are listed in Appendix 4.

(c) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

of this nature is tremendous. The effect of this was that we found nearly as many specific tests in use as there were colleges using them. Hence, we have not reported data on specific test usage. Rather we have grouped the specific tests according to subject-matter area, and reported frequency of usage in each area.

Seventy-six percent of the colleges made initial use of achievement tests (Table 13). There was no difference between public and independent colleges in this respect.

As might be expected the primary, and nearly exclusive, purpose of using achievement tests initially was course placement. As Table 14 shows, ninety-six percent of the using colleges reported this purpose, and these included all of the using independent colleges.

The kinds of achievement tests used by the colleges fell into seven different subject-matter areas as indicated in Table 15. A high proportion of the colleges used achievement tests in English (81%), and a substantial proportion (56%) used initial mathematics achievement tests. The forty-two percent that is indicated for initial reading tests does not accurately reflect the colleges' assessment of reading ability. In some cases, reading scores were obtained as part of the English test that the college used. The twenty colleges that are classified as using reading tests are those colleges that used tests exclusively designed to assess reading ability.

Initial Use of Interest Inventories

This category of instruments is fairly well defined and needs no explanation. In Table 16, we have reported the frequency with which these instruments were used. About one-half of the sample colleges used interest inventories. One-third used them with their entire freshman classes. Independent colleges tended to make more use of interest inventories than public colleges.

Except for two independent colleges (Table 17), every college using interest inventories used them for guidance purposes. As shown in Table 18 the Kuder Preference Record (KPR) was the most frequently used inventory; however, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) saw substantial use in the public colleges. Although not shown in the tables, it is interesting to note that three of the public institutions used both KPR and SVIB.

TABLE 13

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Achievement Tests

Tests Used	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	32	76	16	76	48	76
No	10	24	5	24	15	24
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

TABLE 14

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Achievement Tests According to Purpose of Testing[a]

Purpose of Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]
Selective admission	1	3	0	0	1	2
Guidance or counseling	6	19	3	19	9	19
Course placement	30	94	16	100	46	96
Research	0	0	2	13	2	4
Service to outsiders	0	0	1	6	1	2
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Colleges Using Achievement Tests	32		16		48	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

TABLE 15

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Achievement Tests According to Subject-Matter Area(a)

Subject-Matter Area	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent(b)	Number	Percent(b)	Number	Percent(b)
Business	2	6	2	12	4	8
Chemistry	7	22	0	0	7	15
English	27	84	12	75	39	81
Foreign Language	7	22	8	50	15	31
Mathematics	17	53	10	63	27	56
Reading	14	44	6	37	20	42
Social Studies	1	3	0	0	1	2
Number of Colleges Using Achievement Tests	32		16		48	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

TABLE 16

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Interest Inventories According to Extent of Usage

Extent of Usage	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Used with entire freshman class	12	29	9	43	21	33
Used with subgroups of freshman class only	9	21	3	14	12	19
Not used	21	50	9	43	30	48
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

TABLE 17

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Interest Inventories According to Purpose of Testing[a]

Purpose of Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]
Selective admission	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guidance or counseling	21	100	11	92	32	97
Course placement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Research	0	0	1	8	1	3
Service to outsiders	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	1	8	1	3
Number of Colleges Using Interest Inventories	21		12		33	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

TABLE 18

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Interest Inventories According to Specific Test(a)

Test(b)	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent(c)	Number	Percent(c)	Number	Percent(c)
Kuder Preference Record (KPR)	12	57	8	67	20	61
Occupational Interest Inventory (OII)	1	5	1	8	2	6
Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB)	9	43	1	8	10	30
Thurstone Interest Schedule (TIS)	0	0	1	8	1	3
Unidentified(d)	2	10	1	8	3	9
Number of Colleges Using Interest Inventories	21		12		33	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The tests and publishers are listed in Appendix 4.

(c) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

(d) The colleges included here made initial use of an interest inventory, but we were not able to determine which specific instruments were used.

Initial Use of Special Aptitude Tests

We have included in this section not only the use of multiple aptitude test batteries, but also the initial use of specialized aptitude tests dealing with specific vocations or skills such as nursing aptitude or mechanical aptitude.

Nearly forty percent of the sample colleges made some initial use of special aptitude tests, primarily with subgroups of the entering freshman class (Table 19). A slightly higher proportion of public colleges used them, although among independent colleges they were used to a greater degree with the entire freshman class.

Table 20 shows that while most of the colleges used these tests for guidance or counseling, they were also used for selective admissions and course placement. This involved using the tests for admission to certain degree programs such as nursing or engineering, and placement in courses requiring certain levels of skills such as shorthand or typing.

The use of four different aptitude batteries was encountered, and their frequency of usage is shown in Table 21. In this table we have grouped the aptitude tests for specific vocations or skills into the last category ("Other") since each of these tests was used by only one college. Of the aptitude batteries, the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) was used most frequently and its use was exclusively in public junior colleges. The Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT) were reported in use at four colleges. Six of the seven independent colleges that reported using these special aptitude tests, administered them for specific vocational areas while ten of the public colleges did so.

Initial Use of Personality Tests

The frequency of use of personality tests in the sample colleges is surprisingly high, since it is questionable whether this kind of instrument has any general utility in academic situations. Nearly one-third of the colleges administered a personality test either to the entire group of entering freshmen or to subgroups (Table 22). It should be remembered that the incidents of usage reported here do not include administration of tests to individuals as is often done in intensive counseling situations. Nearly forty percent of the independent colleges used personality tests, and three-fourths of those using the tests administered them to the entire freshman class. Only about one-fourth of the public colleges used them and the use was predominately with subgroups of entering freshmen.

TABLE 19

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Special Aptitude Tests According to Extent of Usage

Extent of Usage	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Used with entire freshman class	6	14	4	19	10	16
Used with subgroups of freshman class only	11	26	3	14	14	22
Not used	25	60	14	67	39	62
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

TABLE 20

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Special Aptitude Tests According to Purpose of Testing(a)

Purpose of Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent(b)	Number	Percent(b)	Number	Percent(b)
Selective admission	2	12	1	14	3	13
Guidance or counseling	13	76	6	86	19	79
Course placement	3	18	2	29	5	21
Research	0	0	0	0	0	0
Service to outsiders	1	6	0	0	1	4
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Colleges Using Special Aptitude Tests	17		7		24	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

TABLE 21

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Special Aptitude Tests According to Specific Test[a]

Test[b]	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[c]	Number	Percent[c]	Number	Percent[c]
Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT)	3	18	1	14	4	17
General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB)	6	35	0	0	6	25
Multiple Aptitude Tests (CMAT)	0	0	1	14	1	4
Primary Mental Abilities (PMA)	1	6	0	0	1	4
Other[d]	10	59	6	86	16	67
Number of Colleges Using Special Aptitude Tests	17		7		24	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The tests and publishers are listed in Appendix 4.

(c) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

(d) Includes aptitude tests for specific vocational areas and skills.

TABLE 22

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Personality Tests According to Extent of Usage

	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
Extent of Usage	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Used with entire freshman class	2	5	6	29	8	13
Used with subgroups of freshman class only	9	21	2	10	11	17
Not used	31	74	13	62	44	70
Total	42	100	21	101(a)	63	100

(a) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

The purposes of using personality tests as reported by the colleges fall into two categories--guidance or counseling, and research. Of the eleven public colleges using the tests, seven were using them for guidance purposes and four for research purposes. Of the eight independent colleges, seven administered the tests for guidance purposes and one for research purposes. Since the specific instruments used at each college differed from that used at any other college, we have not reported frequency of usage for any specific tests.

Summary of Initial Testing

In order to provide some summary of this important and major area of junior college testing, we have prepared Tables 23 and 24, which show the amount of initial testing done by the sample colleges. The testing of subgroups as well as entire groups of entering freshmen is included in these data.

In Table 23 we have considered the six different kinds of tests which the sample colleges were using; that is, general ability tests, broad subject-matter tests, achievement tests, interest inventories, special aptitude tests, and personality tests. Each college might have used one or more of these six different kinds. Table 23 shows the number of different kinds used by each college. We can see that a small proportion (3%) were using all six kinds, and a small proportion (6%) were using only one kind. Colleges tended to use 2, 3, 4, or 5 kinds in about equal proportion, with almost one-half of the colleges using at least four different kinds. The independent colleges tended to use fewer kinds than the public colleges. Sixty-two percent of the independent colleges used fewer than four kinds while only fifty percent of the public colleges did so.

As we have noted before, some colleges administered more than one test of a given kind to their entering students. In Table 24 we have shown the number of different tests used initially by each college without regard to kind of test. All of the sample colleges used at least one standardized test with the entering students. Several colleges used as many as ten or eleven. The median number of tests used by public colleges is four and the median number of tests for independend colleges is five. Thirty-five percent of the public colleges used more than five tests while nearly fifty percent of the independent colleges did so.

TABLE 23

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Standardized Tests According to Number of Different Kinds of Tests[a] Administered

Number of Different Kinds of Tests Administered	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
One	3	7	1	5	4	6
Two	13	31	3	14	16	25
Three	5	12	9	43	14	22
Four	11	26	2	10	13	21
Five	9	21	5	24	14	22
Six	1	2	1	5	2	3
Total	42	99[b]	21	101[b]	63	99[b]

(a) The six different kinds of tests considered are: general ability tests, broad subject-matter area tests, achievement tests, interest inventories, special aptitude tests, and personality tests.

(b) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 24

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Initial Use of Standardized Tests According to Number of Different Tests Administered

Number of Different Tests Administered	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
One	3	7	1	5	4	6
Two	8	19	0	0	8	13
Three	4	10	3	14	7	11
Four	7	17	1	5	8	13
Five	5	12	6	29	11	17
Six	2	5	6	29	8	13
Seven	6	14	1	5	7	11
Eight	2	5	1	5	3	5
Nine	1	2	1	5	2	3
Ten	3	7	1	5	4	6
Eleven	1	2	0	0	1	2
Total	42	100	21	102(a)	63	100

(a) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

Subsequent Use of Standardized Tests

Thus far we have considered testing which the colleges did initially with entering students, i.e., before the end of the first semester. In addition, some colleges administered tests to groups of students who had completed the first semester of the freshman year or were second-year students. We are referring here only to institutional use of tests for administrative reasons; not to teacher use of tests for classroom evaluation which is discussed separately.

Table 25 shows that thirty percent of the colleges administered standardized tests to groups of students who had progressed beyond the first semester. The proportion of independent colleges that did so (48%) is over twice as great as the proportion of public colleges (21%).

The purposes for which this testing was done are shown in Table 26. The testing was done primarily for comprehensive evaluation or for research purposes. Public colleges tended to do this testing in order to evaluate student ability in specific areas--usually English, reading, or mathematics. The independent colleges made no subsequent use of tests for subject-matter evaluation but tended to do this testing for comprehensive evaluation or research.

The specific tests used for subsequent evaluation are shown in Table 27. Eight different tests or testing programs were reported with the Cooperative English Tests being used most frequently.

Teacher Use of Standardized Tests

The teacher's use of standardized tests for classroom evaluation seemed to be a minor practice in junior colleges. It was encountered at only thirteen of the sixty-three colleges (Table 28) and seemed to be more prevalent among public institutions (24%) than independent (14%). Table 29 shows the extent of usage by subject-matter area.

In discussing this practice during the interviews, two comments were universally made. First, it was reported that classroom evaluation was entirely the province of the individual teacher. No attempt was ever made by the administration or others to dictate or specify to the teacher what kinds of tests or evaluation methods should be used in the classroom. In many instances it was reported that teachers sometimes sought help from others at the college, particularly from staff members in the guidance or counseling areas, when they were having difficulty with evaluation procedures. Second, it was reported that

TABLE 25

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Subsequent Use[(a)] of Standardized Tests

Subsequent Use of Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	9	21	10	48	19	30
No	33	79	11	52	44	70
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

(a) Defined as administration of tests by the college to groups of students subsequent to the first semester of the freshman year. Does not include classroom use of tests by teachers.

TABLE 26

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Subsequent Use[a] of Standardized Tests According to Purpose of Testing[b]

Purpose of Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[c]	Number	Percent[c]	Number	Percent[c]
Evaluation in specific subject matter area	4	44	0	0	4	21
Comprehensive evaluation	3	33	5	50	8	42
Research	2	22	5	50	7	37
Service to outsiders	2	22	3	30	5	26
Number of Colleges Making Subsequent Use of Tests	9		10		19	

(a) Defined as administration of tests by the college to groups of students subsequent to the first semester of the freshman year. Does not include classroom use of tests by teachers.

(b) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(c) The percentages are based on the number of colleges making subsequent use of tests.

TABLE 27

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Subsequent Use[a] of Standardized Tests According to Specific Test[b]

Test[c]	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[d]	Number	Percent[d]	Number	Percent[d]
ACS Cooperative Examination (ACS)	2	22	0	0	2	11
Cooperative English Tests (CET)	3	33	2	20	5	26
Comprehensive College Testing Program (CCTP)	1	11	1	10	2	11
General Culture Test (GCT)	0	0	1	10	1	5
Graduate Record Examinations (GRE)	0	0	1	10	1	5
Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	2	22	4	40	6	32
School and College Ability Tests (SCAT)	1	11	1	10	2	11
Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP)	2	22	2	20	4	21
Number of Colleges Making Subsequent Use of Tests	9		10		19	

(a) Defined as administration of tests by the college to groups of students subsequent to the first semester of the freshman year. Does not include classroom use of tests by teachers.

(b) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(c) The tests and publishers are listed in Appendix 4.

(d) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

TABLE 28

Numbers and Percents of Colleges in which Teachers Use Standardized Tests for Classroom Evaluation

Teacher Use of Tests	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	10	24	3	14	13	21
No	32	76	18	86	50	79
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

TABLE 29

Numbers and Percents of Colleges in which Teachers Use Standardized Tests for Classroom Evaluation According to Subject-Matter Area[a]

Subject-Matter Area	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]	Number	Percent[b]
English	2	20	1	33	3	23
Foreign Language	3	30	0	0	3	23
Mathematics	2	20	0	0	2	15
Reading	2	20	1	33	3	23
Science	5	50	1	33	6	46
Number of Colleges in which Teachers Use Standardized Tests	10		3		13	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

teachers primarily used locally constructed essay-type examinations for classroom evaluation. Occasionally it was reported that teachers constructed their own objective tests, and at two institutions there were departmental efforts to build files of objective test items which teachers could draw from in order to assemble their own objective tests. It was commonly felt that published standardized achievement tests did not relate closely enough to the content of specific courses to warrant their extensive use as classroom evaluation devices.

Specialized Use of Standardized Tests

Twenty-nine of the colleges made specialized use of four different testing programs. These are listed in Table 30. Ten of the colleges made use of scores from the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations to give entering students advanced standings or to release them from taking certain basic or required courses. This practice was considerably more prevalent among independent colleges than among public colleges. Three colleges (all public) made special use of the Scholastic Aptitude Test, requiring it of certain special kinds of entering students. The Test of English as a Foreign Language was used by three colleges (all public) to assess the English language ability of students whose native language was not English. Sixteen colleges accepted scores on the Tests of General Educational Development in lieu of graduation from an accredited high school.

Use of Standardized Tests With Individual Students

Most of the colleges in the sample (73%) had made provisions for individual testing of students. This was usually carried out as part of the counseling functions at the college. The college usually kept a file of different kinds of tests (as many as 60 or 70 in some instances) which counselors could administer to individual students as the need became evident. As shown in Table 31, the practice was about equally prevalent in public and independent colleges.

Other Related Testing Practices

Two activities were investigated which do not relate directly to testing practices but do have some indirect relevance. These are the extent to which colleges participate in national testing programs by serving as test centers, and the extent to which colleges provide in-service training in measurement for teachers.

TABLE 30

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Making Specialized Use of Standardized Tests According to Test Used(a)

Test(b)	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent(c)	Number	Percent(c)	Number	Percent(c)
Advanced Placement Examinations (APE)	3	16	7	70	10	34
Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	3	16	0	0	3	10
Tests of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)	3	16	0	0	3	10
Tests of General Educational Development (GED)	13	68	3	30	16	55
Number of Colleges Making Specialized Use of Tests	19		10		29	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The tests and publishers are listed in Appendix 4.

(c) The percentages are based on the number of colleges using the tests.

TABLE 31

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Administering Standardized Tests to Individual Students

Administer Tests to Individual Students	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	31	74	15	71	46	73
No	11	26	6	29	17	27
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

Testing Centers

Table 32 shows that over half of the colleges (57%) served as test centers for one or more of four national testing programs. Forty-four percent of the colleges were test centers for the ACT Program, and these tended to be the public colleges. Nineteen percent were centers for the College Entrance Examination Board, with the proportion being higher among independent junior colleges (29%) than among public colleges (14%). Small proportions of colleges (all public) served as centers for the Graduate Record Examinations or the Tests of General Educational Development. It is interesting to note that of the thirty-six colleges that were test centers, thirty served as centers for only one program, four were centers for two programs, and two colleges acted as centers for three of the national testing programs.

In-service Measurement Training

Five of the sixty-three colleges reported that they were currently undertaking some kind of in-service measurement training program for teachers (Table 33), and six colleges reported that they had formerly had such a program, but were not presently doing anything along this line. Eighteen percent of the colleges, then, felt that this was sufficiently important to undertake specific programs to develop the measurement skills of their teachers.

When further querried about in-service measurement training programs, thirty-three of the colleges indicated interest in either undertaking such a program or of expanding their present program.

Use of Standardized Test Scores

In the previous discussions we have considered the purposes which junior colleges have in using various kinds of tests. These purposes imply certain uses of the test scores but are necessarily quite general. For example, if a college uses test scores for placement, it has some specific way of converting the test scores into useable information upon which decisions can be, at least partially, based. However, there are a variety of ways of making this conversion--establishing cutting scores in some way, combining test scores with other information, combining the results of several different tests, etc. There are no hard and fast rules for doing this and each college develops its own methods which seem to work best. The same thing can be said of using test information for counseling purposes. Each counselor has his own particular way of bringing test information

TABLE 32

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Serving as Test Centers for National Testing Programs(a)

National Testing Program(b)	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent(c)	Number	Percent(c)	Number	Percent(c)
American College Testing Program	24	57	4	19	28	44
College Entrance Examination Board	6	14	6	29	12	19
Graduate Record Examinations	1	2	0	0	1	2
Tests of General Educational Development	3	7	0	0	3	5
Did not serve as a test center	15	36	12	57	27	43
Total Number of Colleges	42		21		63	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

(b) The tests and publishers are listed in Appendix 4.

(c) The percentages are based on the total number of colleges.

TABLE 33

Numbers and Percents of Colleges that Have In-Service Training Programs in Measurement

	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
In-Service Measurement Programs	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Presently available	4	10	1	5	5	8
Formerly, but not presently available	4	10	2	10	6	10
Not available, either presently or formerly	34	81	18	86	52	83
Total	42	101 (a)	21	101 (a)	63	101 (a)

(a) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

to bear on the counseling of a particular student. While we are not able to report information on the wide variety of specific ways in which test scores are used, we did obtain some further indication of test score usage. In this section we shall consider three additional indications of the ways that junior colleges use test scores--prepare local norms, make the test results available to faculty members, and make the test results available to students.

Constructing and Using Local Norms

We are considering here only those instances where the colleges made conscious effort to obtain or prepare and use distributions of scores based on tests administered to their own students. We have, then, eliminated those instances where colleges might, through participation in a national testing program, receive local distributions of scores but make no particular use of them. Table 34 shows that over half of the colleges (59%) obtained and used local norms for tests that were administered to the students. The practice was more prevalent among public colleges (62%) than among independent colleges (52%).

Reporting Test Scores to Faculty

It goes almost without saying that test score information is always available to the counselors and guidance staff at junior colleges. Some junior colleges have counseling systems that involve participation of faculty members who act as advisors or counselors for certain students or groups of students. In this section we are considering the availability of test scores to faculty members who are not involved in student counseling. At thirty-five percent of the colleges (Table 35) the non-counseling faculty received all test information routinely, although they may have received the information only for students in their own courses. Forty percent of the colleges had established systems whereby the test information was not routinely reported to faculty members but was readily available to any faculty member who requested it. Twenty-five percent of the colleges had no system for reporting test information to the faculty. At public colleges the tendency was to report test information only on request of a faculty member, while independent colleges tended to report the test scores routinely.

Reporting Test Scores to Students

Over eighty percent of the sample colleges made the results of tests available to students. This was done in several ways, mostly in individual

TABLE 34

Numbers and Percents of Colleges that Make Use of Local Norms

Use Local Norms	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	26	62	11	52	37	59
No	16	38	10	48	26	41
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

TABLE 35

Numbers and Percents of Colleges that Report Test Scores to Faculty(a)

Faculty Receive Test Scores	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Routinely	12	29	10	48	22	35
On Request	19	45	6	29	25	40
Not reported to faculty	11	26	5	24	16	25
Total	42	100	21	101(b)	63	100

(a) Does not include faculty members who also act as counselors.

(b) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

counseling situations where the student received considerable help in interpreting his scores. As Table 36 shows, sixty percent of the colleges provided the test information to students in this way. At twenty-one percent of the colleges, test scores were routinely reported to students, and in most of these instances (19%) the opportunity was offered to students to obtain help in interpreting the scores.

Testing Needs and Problems

During the course of the interviews, we sought not only information about the colleges' current testing practices, but also information about testing needs and problems. We undertook the interviews with no preconceptions as to what these needs and problems might be. In fact, ascertaining the nature of the needs and problems was a major goal of the study. Consequently, we did not ask the colleges whether "such and such" was a need they felt or a problem they were experiencing. This is an important point to remember in considering the data reported below. Needs and problems mentioned by only a few colleges assume greater importance and cannot be neglected or ignored. On the other hand, had we gone to each college with a specified list of needs and problems and asked the college to indicate whether each one was a need or problem for them, we might have obtained quite different results. In this circumstance, we might have been disposed to pay little attention to those needs and problems receiving only a few "votes".

The fact that our sample colleges mentioned their testing needs and problems in an unstructured situation presented somewhat of a problem for us in attempting to summarize the data for this report. The colleges indicated their needs and problems in a variety of ways. Our task in compiling the data was to classify the variously expressed needs and problems into a manageable number of meaningful categories. We were able to condense the information into eighteen different categories. The frequency with which these categories of needs and problems were expressed by the colleges is shown in Table 37.

1. Need for Comprehensive Tests. These are tests that would be administered to groups of students at the end of their program. We have included both the expressed need for this kind of test and the expressed need for the college to do this kind of testing. As was noted above (Table 26), comprehensive evaluation is not a common practice among junior colleges. Only eight of the sample colleges did this kind of testing. As shown in Table 37, however,

TABLE 36

Numbers and Percents of Colleges that Report Test Scores to Students

Students Receive Test Scores	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Routinely without interpretation	1	2	0	0	1	2
Routinely with interpretation	9	21	3	14	12	19
Only in individual counseling	25	60	13	62	38	60
Not reported to students	7	17	5	24	12	19
Total	42	100	21	100	63	100

TABLE 37

Numbers and Percents of Colleges Reporting Various Testing Needs and Problems[a]

Testing Need or Problem	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Comprehensive tests	11	26	9	43	20	32
2. Vocational tests	10	24	0	0	10	16
3. Differential guidance tests	15	36	2	10	17	27
4. Classroom tests	2	5	4	19	6	10
5. Non-intellective tests	6	14	5	24	11	17
6. Achievement tests	30	71	7	33	37	59
7. Shorter tests	6	14	0	0	6	10
8. Lower-level tests	8	19	0	0	8	13
9. Junior college norms	10	24	4	19	14	22
10. Research on tests	14	33	7	33	21	33
11. In-service measurement training	24	57	11	52	35	56
12. Misuse of test information	4	10	1	5	5	8
13. Inadequacy of specific test(s)	28	67	10	48	38	60
14. Exchange of testing information	3	7	0	0	3	5
15. Making test results useful	16	38	7	33	23	37
16. Test selection or construction	8	19	8	38	16	25
17. Test administration	12	29	0	0	12	19
18. Outside pressure	11	26	2	10	13	21
Total Number of Colleges	42		21		63	

(a) Colleges may be included more than once in the table.

twenty of the colleges mentioned this as a need. A higher proportion of the independent colleges (43%) was concerned about this kind of evaluation than of the public colleges (26%).

2. Need for Tests in Vocational Areas. The tests included here are those that measure skills and abilities that are taught in vocational training programs. We have included both the generally expressed need for this kind of test as well as the expressed need for tests in specific vocational areas. This need was mentioned at ten of the colleges, all of which were public institutions.

3. Need for Differential Guidance Tests. These are tests that might assist the college in guiding students into various types of programs. As might be expected the need for this kind of test was expressed more frequently by public institutions (36%) where the variety of available programs is generally greater and where guidance of students into various programs is more of a problem. Only two of the independent colleges indicated this as a need.

4. Need for Standardized Classroom Tests. Standardized tests are infrequently used by junior college teachers (see Table 28). Hence, we might expect to find that only six colleges expressed any need for this kind of test. It should also be pointed out that this particular need would more likely be expressed by a classroom teacher than by any other junior college staff member. As shown in Table 3, however, teachers were interviewed at only nine of the colleges.

5. Need for Methods of Assessing Non-Intellective Characteristics. This was often expressed as the need to find out about such student characteristics as motivation, creativity, persistence, interests, attitudes, etc. It was usually mentioned in connection with either admissions or guidance activities, and the desired goal was to be able to predict better the student's future performance either generally or in a specified program.

Eleven of the colleges mentioned this as a need and the independent colleges seemed to be more concerned (24%) than the public colleges (14%).

6. Need for Various Kinds of Subject-Matter Achievement Tests. This category includes only the need for achievement tests for institutional use--as opposed to Number 4, above, which considered the need for achievement tests for classroom use by teachers. This need was most often expressed in connection with placement testing, and was one of the most frequently mentioned needs--fifty-nine percent of the colleges so indicated, with the proportion being seventy-one percent among public colleges.

7. Need for Shorter Tests. This appeared primarily as a protest against the amount of time spent in testing, particularly in initial testing. The six colleges that mentioned this (all public) did not want to forego any of the information they were obtaining from the tests, but rather obtain the information with a lesser amount of time invested.

8. Need for Lower-Level Tests. Eight of the colleges (all public) felt that the tests they were using were appropriate for the students of higher ability (for example, those in the university-parallel program) but that the tests were too difficult for many of the other students. This need was probably felt to a greater degree by the public colleges because of the wide spectrum of ability represented in the students enrolling in or applying to public institutions. The independent colleges, on the other hand, probably experienced the same effect, but considered it as a necessary or desirable part of admissions, rather than as a problem.

9. Need for Junior College Norms. Fourteen of the colleges (22%) mentioned that they would like to have or needed test norms based on junior college students.

10. Need for Research on Tests. One-third of the colleges felt that they needed to do more research with tests. This might have been mentioned in connection with institutional research, validity studies, establishing placement procedure, or determining how to use test scores in admissions.

11. Need for In-Service Measurement Training. Over half of both the public and the independent colleges felt that they needed some kind of in-service measurement training. This need is directly related to Number 15, below (need to make test results useful), since many colleges felt that they were not making maximum use of the test information they were obtaining, and thought that additional measurement training for staff members might rectify the situation. The kinds of in-service training mentioned ranged all the way from intensive workshops to the distribution of appropriate literature.

12. Misuse of Test Information. A few colleges (5) felt that misuse of test information created a problem. The concern was felt in situations where test information was used to evaluate individual students and in situations where test information might be used to evaluate institutions.

13. Inadequacy of Specific Test(s). We have included in this category those instances where a problem was mentioned involving a specific test the college was using or contemplating. The test was too long, too difficult, too hard to score, did not predict, did not have the right norms, was difficult to administer, etc. As might be expected, this was the most popular category of testing problems. Sixty percent of the colleges indicated some dissatisfaction with a specific test.

14. Exchange of Testing Information Among Junior Colleges. Three of the colleges felt that it would be helpful for them to learn more about how other junior colleges were using tests. While these colleges realized that testing practices which were successful at one college might not work at another college, they felt that knowing about testing practices which other colleges had found successful (or unsuccessful) might give them some ideas about how they might make their own testing programs more useful or valuable.

15. Making Test Results Useful or Meaningful. A substantial number of colleges (37%) felt that the test results should be made more meaningful to students or to faculty members. In some instances colleges felt that much of their test information was merely lying in files or folders, and that no one was really making any use of it. This was one of the most frequently mentioned problems facing the junior college.

16. Test Selection or Test Construction. We have included here those situations in which a college or a teacher wanted to use a test for some specific purpose but was having difficulty in selecting the appropriate test or in constructing a test to meet the need. Twenty-five percent of the colleges were having difficulty of this nature, and the problem seemed more prevalent among independent colleges (38%) than among public colleges (19%).

17. Test Administration. A few of the colleges indicated they were having problems related to the administration of standardized tests. These included inadequate testing facilities, difficulty in getting the tests scored, lack of help in administering the tests, etc. Twelve colleges (all public) mentioned this kind of problem.

18. Outside Pressure on Testing Practices. Thirteen of the colleges reported that certain of their testing practices were affected by pressure from external sources. Most frequently this took the form of a college administering a certain test, not because it wanted to or because it found the results useful, but because all the other colleges were doing it or because it was required by the four-year institutions that would be receiving many transferring students. This was a problem to a greater degree among public junior colleges than among independent ones.

Faculty and Student Interest in Testing

Information on faculty and student interest in standardized testing is probably less reliable and certainly less complete than the other data contained in this report. In the first place, we did not obtain much information directly from faculty members or students. Consequently, our data are mostly "second hand" reports primarily from administrative or pupil personnel staff members. In many cases the information about faculty and student interest in tests obtained from these sources was probably quite accurate. In other instances, the persons interviewed did not feel that they could make such judgments. In the second place, it is difficult to generalize about faculty interest or student interest. Both the faculty and the student body at any institution are made up of many individuals, and, often, many different attitudes are represented among the faculty or among students. Consequently, it may be somewhat meaningless to talk about "the faculty attitude", or "the student attitude". Nevertheless, we did attempt to obtain information about faculty and student interest and thereby to characterize each institution. In those instances where this was not possible we have classified the institution into a "not ascertainable" category. Tables 38 and 39 contain the data which we obtained.

Faculty Interest in Testing

In general, we can characterize junior college faculty members as having at least "some interest" in the results of standardized tests administered to students. As shown in Table 38, over half of the colleges (56%) characterized their faculties as having at least some interest, while thirty-two percent indicated that faculty members were eager to have this information about students. Only twenty-two percent of the colleges felt that faculty had little interest in standardized test information. We were not able to ascertain the faculty interest at twenty-two percent of the sample colleges. The faculty at independent colleges seem to be more extreme in their interest, with larger proportions either eager to have the information (43%) or having little interest (33%). The public colleges seem to be distributed more evenly, with the highest proportions (29%) having moderate interest in the results of tests.

Several colleges provided additional information on faculty attitudes toward standardized tests. At nine of the colleges the faculty was characterized as having some interest in using standardized tests for classroom evaluation.

TABLE 38

Numbers and Percents of Colleges According to Faculty Interest in Testing

Faculty Interest in Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Eager to have test information	11	26	9	43	20	32
Some interest in having test information	12	29	3	14	15	24
Little interest in having test information	7	17	7	33	14	22
Not ascertainable	12	29	2	10	14	22
Total	42	101 (a)	21	100	63	100

(a) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 39

Numbers and Percents of Colleges According to Student Interest in Testing

Student Interest in Testing	Public Colleges		Independent Colleges		All Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Eager to have test information	15	36	9	43	24	38
Some interest in having test information	3	7	2	10	5	8
Little interest in having test information	3	7	4	19	7	11
Not ascertainable	21	50	6	29	27	43
Total	42	100	21	101 (a)	63	100

(a) The percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

At four of the colleges it was reported that the faculty seemed to place too much reliance on the information obtained from tests, and tended not to recognize the limitations of this kind of information.

Student Interest in Testing

Using the same scale of "interest in having test information", we attempted to classify the student body at each institution. Unfortunately we were not able to do this at a substantial proportion of colleges (43%). Allowing for the fact that we have information for only slightly over half of the colleges, we could characterize the students at the remaining colleges as overwhelmingly interested in the results of their tests. As shown in Table 39, forty-six percent of the colleges characterized the students as having at least some interest in the test results, and at thirty-eight percent of the colleges students were eager to have the information. Only eleven percent of the colleges reported little interest on the part of the students.

SUMMARY

We have presented, in this report, information on junior college practices, problems, and attitudes concerning standardized tests. The information is based on the results of interviews with staff members at a selected sample of sixty-three public and private junior colleges in eighteen states. An analysis of the characteristics of the sixty-three sample colleges shows that the sample is reasonably representative of the population of junior colleges with respect to four variables--control (public, independent), size (number of full-time students enrolled), type of student body (men, women, coed), and type of college (residential, commuting). The sample appears to be somewhat over-represented with large, public, commuting junior colleges. Interviews were conducted with one hundred forty junior college staff members representing presidents, deans, admission officers, directors of student personnel, directors of testing, counselors, and teachers.

In this report we have attempted neither to evaluate the specific testing practices nor to offer solutions for testing problems. These activities can be undertaken only with respect to the individual situations in which the tests are being used or in which problems are encountered. We have tried here merely to report the situations as we found them and to summarize this information in meaningful ways.

In order to summarize some of the information contained in this report we have described below the typical testing practices (and non-practices) of public and of independent junior colleges. For this purpose a testing practice is considered typical if it was encountered at at least fifty percent of the sample colleges.

Typical Testing Practices at Public Junior Colleges

The following represent "typical" testing practices at the forty-two public junior colleges included in the sample:

1. Administered a general ability test to the entire entering freshman class for purposes of guidance and course placement (Tables 4 and 5).

2. Did not administer an intelligence test (test yielding an IQ score) to entering students (Table 8).

3. Administered a broad subject-matter area test to the entire freshman class for guidance purposes (Tables 10 and 11).
4. Administered achievement tests in English and mathematics to entering students for course placement purposes (Tables 13, 14, and 15).
5. Administered an interest inventory to the entire freshman class or to a subgroup for guidances purposes (Tables 16 and 17).
6. Did not administer special aptitude tests to entering students (Table 19).
7. Did not administer personality tests to entering students (Table 22).
8. Administered at least four different standardized tests to entering students (Table 24).
9. Did not make subsequent use of standardized tests (Table 25).
10. Made no use of standardized tests for classroom evaluation (Table 28).
11. Administered standardized tests to individual students for counseling purposes (Table 31).
12. Served as a test center for a national testing program (Table 32).
13. Had never conducted a program of in-service measurement training for faculty, but was interested in doing so (Table 33).
14. Prepared and used local norms for standardized tests (Table 34).
15. Reported test scores to faculty members either routinely or on request (Table 35).
16. Reported test scores to students only in individual counseling situations (Table 36).

17. Had a faculty that was at least moderately interested in having standardized test information about students (Table 38).

Typical Testing Practices at Independent Junior Colleges

The following represent "typical" testing practices at the twenty-one independent junior colleges included in the sample:

1. Administered a general ability test to the entire entering freshman class for purposes of selective admission and guidance (Tables 4 and 5).

2. Administered an intelligence test (test yielding an IQ score) to the entire entering freshman class or to a subgroup of the entering freshmen for guidance purposes (Tables 8 and 9).

3. Did not administer a broad subject-matter area test to entering freshmen (Table 10).

4. Administered achievement tests in English, mathematics, and foreign languages for course placement purposes (Tables 13, 14, and 15).

5. Administered an interest inventory to the entire entering freshman class or to a subgroup for guidance purposes (Tables 16 and 17).

6. Did not administer a special aptitude test to entering students (Table 19).

7. Did not administer personality tests to entering students (Table 22).

8. Administered at least five different standardized tests to entering students (Table 24).

9. Did not make subsequent use of standardized tests (48% did, 52% did not) (Table 25).

10. Made no use of standardized tests for classroom evaluation (Table 28).

11. Administered standardized tests to individual students for counseling purposes (Table 31).
12. Did not serve as a test center for a national testing program (Table 32).
13. Had never conducted a program of in-service measurement training for faculty but was interested in doing so (Table 33).
14. Prepared and used local norms for standardized tests (Table 34).
15. Reported test scores to faculty members either routinely or on request (Table 35).
16. Reported test scores to students only in individual counseling situations (Table 36).
17. Had a faculty that was at least moderately interested in having standardized test information about students (Table 38).
18. Had a student body that was at least moderately interested in having the results of their standardized tests (Table 39).

Testing Needs and Problems

Eighteen various testing needs and problems as expressed by the colleges are reported in Table 37. While none of these can be ignored or neglected, those needs that seemed of most concern to public junior colleges are the needs for differential guidance tests, subject-matter achievement tests, more research on tests, in-service measurement training for faculty, and the need to make test results more useful. Most of the public colleges also indicated that the specific tests they were using or contemplating were unsatisfactory in some way.

The needs of most concern to independent junior colleges are the needs for comprehensive tests or testing, subject-matter achievement tests, research on tests, in-service measurement training, and the need to make test results more useful. In addition, the independent junior colleges seemed to be concerned about problems of test selection or construction, and indicated that specific tests being used were unsatisfactory in some way.

Conclusions

It seems evident that standardized tests are widely and extensively used in both public and independent junior colleges. Although the colleges experience some problems in using the tests and are somewhat critical of them, it seems reasonable to conclude that standardized tests are meeting many of the junior college evaluation needs. Generally, the tests are used successfully in admission, guidance, placement and, to some extent, research. They are used most intensively during an initial period extending through the first semester and very little thereafter.

But, apparently the situation is far from satisfactory. Aside from the problems such as lack of appropriate norms, difficulty in locating or selecting appropriate tests, and inadequate use of test information, the junior colleges feel that there is need both for new kinds of tests and for tests to meet new kinds of measurements objectives.

REFERENCES

(1) Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. (editor). 1961 Junior College Directory. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.

(2) Harper, William A. (editor). 1966 Junior College Directory. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C., 1966.

(3) Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. A New Social Invention. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.

(4) Harper, William A. (editor). 1965 Junior College Directory. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C., 1965.

(5) Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. (editor). American Junior Colleges (6th edition). American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1963.

(6) Bulletin of Information, College Board Admissions Tests. College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1965.

(7) ACT Student Information Bulletin, 1963-64. The American College Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa.

(8) Buros, Oscar K. The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook. The Gryphon Press, Highland Park, New Jersey, 1965.

APPENDIX 1

Participating Colleges

Adirondack Community College, Hudson Falls, New York
Allegany Community College, Cumberland, Maryland
Anderson College, Anderson, South Carolina
Antelope Valley College, Lancaster, California
Auburn Community College, Auburn, New York
Bay Path Junior College, Longmeadow, Massachusetts
Bennett College, Millbrook, New York
Berkshire Community College, Pittsfield, Massachusetts
Bradford Junior College, Bradford, Massachusetts
Brevard College, Brevard, North Carolina
Broome Technical Community College, Binghamton, New York
Cazenovia College, Cazenovia, New York
Central Florida Junior College, Ocala, Florida
Citrus Junior College, Azusa, California
Clarke Memorial College, Newton, Mississippi
Coffeyville Community Junior College, Coffeyville, Kansas
College of San Mateo, San Mateo, California
College of the Sequoias, Visalia, California
Contra Costa College, San Pablo, California
Cooke County Junior College, Gainesville, Texas
Copiah-Lincoln Junior College, Wesson, Mississippi
Cottey College, Nevada, Missouri
Diablo Valley College, Concord, California
Emmanuel College, Franklin Springs, Georgia
Fort Smith Junior College, Fort Smith, Arkansas
Frederick Community College, Frederick, Maryland
Fullerton Junior College, Fullerton, California
Green Mountain College, Poultney, Vermont
Gulf Park College, Gulfport, Mississippi
Hill Junior College, Hillsboro, Texas
Hiwassee College, Madisonville, Tennessee
Holyoke Community College, Holyoke, Massachusetts

Hudson Valley Community College, Troy, New York
Junior College of Broward County, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
Leicester Junior College, Leicester, Massachusetts
Long Beach City College, Long Beach, California
Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, California
Marymount College of Virginia, Arlington, Virginia
Mira Costa College, Oceanside, California
Missouri Southern College, Joplin, Missouri
Mohawk Valley Community College, Utica, New York
Monroe Community College, Rochester, New York
Monterey Peninsula College, Monterey, California
Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Maryland
Mount San Antonio Junior College, Walnut, California
Northern Oklahoma College, Tonkawa, Oklahoma
Orange County Community College, Middletown, New York
Palm Beach Junior College, Lake Worth, Florida
Palomar Junior College, San Marcos, California
Panola College, Carthage, Texas
Paul Smith's College of Arts and Sciences, Paul Smiths, New York
Pearl River Junior College, Poplarville, Mississippi
Sacramento City College, Sacramento, California
Saint Gregory College, Shawnee, Oklahoma
San Jose City College, San Jose, California
Sneed Junior College, Boaz, Alabama
Southwest Mississippi Junior College, Summit, Mississippi
Sullins College, Bristol, Virginia
T. J. Harris Junior College, Meridian, Mississippi
Ventura College, Ventura, California
Weatherford College, Weatherford, Texas
Wingate College, Wingate, North Carolina
Worcester Junior College, Worcester, Massachusetts

APPENDIX 2

Initial Contact Letter

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE PRINCETON, N. J. 08540

Evaluation and Advisory Service

Dear____________:

As you will see from the enclosures, the Evaluation and Advisory Service, a Division of Educational Testing Service, is conducting a program of field studies and advisory services oriented toward junior colleges. As a part of this program we are arranging for on-campus visits at a selected group of junior colleges throughout the United States for the purpose of discussing testing practices and needs. _______________ is one of the junior colleges that we would like very much to visit.

The American Association of Junior Colleges, with whom we have discussed the program of on-campus visits, has suggested that our initial contact with each college be with the administrative head of the institution. Consequently, I am writing to you to request such a visit and to ask for your help in making the arrangements. I plan to be in the area from _________________ to ________________ and would appreciate the chance to visit your college sometime during that period.

I do not know whether you or some other staff member is the appropriate person to talk with concerning measurement activities at ___________________. If there is someone else that I should contact, perhaps you would refer this letter and the enclosures to him and let me know so that I might get in touch with him directly. I will plan to phone you concerning this within the next __________________.

My sincerest thanks for any help that you can give me in making these arrangements.

Sincerely yours,

Dean W. Seibel
Director of Field Studies

DWS:bp

Enclosures: Description of Field Studies Program and EAS leaflet.

APPENDIX 3

Description of Field Studies Program

An Evaluation and Advisory Service Program of Field Studies and Advisory Services for Junior Colleges

Background

Junior colleges are a sizeable and rapidly growing educational activity. There is every reason to believe that the future trend of this activity will be toward continual and substantial increase in magnitude.

The educational objectives of junior colleges are a combination of high school objectives, college objectives, and unique objectives that are meeting educational needs met nowhere else. The recency and speed of the junior college movement, combined with widely varied educational objectives and a divergent student population, have created tremendous educational and administrative problems.

It would appear, from an initial examination, that tests can make a valuable contribution toward helping junior colleges solve many problems in the areas of guidance, admission, placement, and evaluation. At the same time, more information needs to be obtained about measurement practices, problems, and needs in junior colleges.

Educational Testing Service has a long-standing desire to assist junior colleges in the improvement of measurement practices and is working cooperatively with the American Association of Junior Colleges toward this end. As a continuation of this effort and in order to become more fully aware of measurement problems and needs, ETS is undertaking a program of field studies and advisory services for junior colleges. The objective of this program is to compile information on testing practices and needs in measurement and evaluation in junior colleges throughout the United States.

Procedure

A number of on-campus visits to junior colleges are being undertaken by the Director of Field Studies. It is hoped that, during the visits, discussions can be held with administrative staff members or faculty who are involved with or concerned about testing at the institution.

The following questions may give some general idea of the nature of the information that will be sought. It is not expected that the discussions will necessarily be limited to these specific questions.

1. Are tests being used at the college for purposes of admission, guidance, placement, course evaluation, institutional research, etc.?

2. What specific tests are used?

3. How are the test results of individual students used? of groups of students?

4. What problems have been encountered in the selection, construction, use, or interpretation of tests?

5. What are the attitudes of the staff toward testing?

6. What are the attitudes of the students toward testing?

7. Is any in-service training in measurement available for the staff?

It is sincerely hoped that these discussions will be of value to the cooperating institutions and to junior colleges in general.

Dean W. Seibel
Director of Field Studies
Evaluation and Advisory Service
Educational Testing Service

APPENDIX 4

Tests and Testing Programs

ACS Cooperative Examination (ACS). American Chemical Society, Tampa, Florida.

Advanced Placement Examinations (APE). College Entrance Examination Board, New York.

American College Testing Program Examination (ACT). American College Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa.

American Council on Education Psychological Examination (ACE). Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey. (This test has been discontinued.)

California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM). California Test Bureau, Monterey, California.

College Qualification Tests (CQT). The Psychological Corporation, New York.

Comprehensive College Testing Program (CCTP). College Entrance Examination Board, New York.

Cooperative English Tests (CET). Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT). The Psychological Corporation, New York.

Florida-Twelfth Grade Testing Program (FTGTP). University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB). United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.

General Culture Test (GCT). Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey. (This test has been discontinued.)

Graduate Record Examinations (GRE). Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability (H-N). Houghton Mifflin Co., New York.

Iowa High School Content Examination (IHSC). Bureau of Educational Research and Service, Iowa City, Iowa.

Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED). Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago, Illinois.

Kuder Preference Record-Occupation and-Vocational (KPR). Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago, Illinois.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT). Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York.

Multiple Aptitude Tests (CMAT). California Test Bureau, Monterey, California.

Occupational Interest Inventory (OII). California Test Bureau, Monterey, California.

Ohio State University Psychological Test (OSU). Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago, Illinois.

Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests (OTIS). Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York.

Primary Mental Abilities (PMA). Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois.

Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). College Entrance Examination Board, New York.

School and College Ability Tests (SCAT). Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP). Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

State University Admissions Examination and Regents Scholarship Examination (NYS). State University of New York, Albany, New York.

Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB). Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., Palo Alto, California.

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). College Entrance Examination Board, New York, and Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

Tests of General Educational Development (GED). General Educational Development Testing Service, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.

Thurstone Interest Schedule (TIS). The Psychological Corporation, New York.